## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA STATESVILLE DIVISION 5:13-CV-00035-RLV (5:08-CR-00051-RLV-DCK-2)

MARCUS DWAYNE PARHAM,	)	
Petitioner,	)	
v.	)	<u>ORDER</u>
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
Respondent.	) ) )	

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on consideration of Petitioner's motions to reconsider the Court's Order dismissing his Section 2255 motion as successive.

On July 10, 2013, the Court entered an Order finding that Petitioner, having already filed an unsuccessful § 2255 motion, had not demonstrated that he had obtained the necessary authorization from the Fourth Circuit to file a second, and therefore successive § 2255 motion. See 28 U.S.C. § 2255(h). (Doc. No. 11). The Court finds that for the reasons stated in the Court's July 10<sup>th</sup> Order of dismissal, and in the Court's Order denying Petitioner's first motion for reconsideration, (Doc. No. 14), the motions for reconsideration must be denied.

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that Petitioner's motions for reconsideration are **DENIED**. (Doc. Nos. 13 and 15).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Cases, this Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability as Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003) (stating that in order to satisfy § 2253(c), a

petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong); <u>Slack v. McDaniel</u>, 529 U.S. 474, 484 (2000) (holding that when relief is denied on procedural grounds, a petitioner must establish both that the correctness of the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable and that the petition states a debatably valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right).

Signed: March 17, 2014

Richard L. Voorhees

United States District Judge